DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 360 SO 008 421

AUTHOR Shea, Brent Mack
TITLE High Schools and the Social Relations of Production.
PUB DATE 1 May 75
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the New England Educational Research Association (Provincetown, Massachusetts, May 1, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Economic Factors; Educational Change; Educational Equality; Educational Research; Employment; Flexible Progression; *High Schools; Productivity; Secondary Education; *Socialization; *Social Relations; *Social Structure; Work Experience

ABSTRACT

Educational research has supported the thesis that educational reforms fail to achieve equality because of similarity of structure between the places of work and schooling. Analysis of the fact that schools replicate the structure of social relations of production presents several problems, including a challenging consumption interpretation, the uncertainty of impact of schooling on noncognitive student attributes, the maladaptive role of schooling in relation to the needs of production, and the absence of an adequate data base. The occurrence of an alienating hidden curriculum, which reproduces the social relations of production through emphasis on conformity, external rewards, and various noncognitive behaviors, has been supported by Ivan Illich but refuted by Herbert Gintis on the basis of historical, economic, and educational research. Current worker dissatisfaction is not easy to explain if it is true that classroom socialization anticipates the social relations of the work place. There is not enough current evidence to say that the structure of social relations in high school is different for students in academic tracks than it is for those in nonacademic tracks. Proposed research with track assignments as the independent variable and classroom socialization as the dependent variable hypothesizes that differences in emphasis or nonemphasis on classroom socialization behaviors will be greater between tracks than within them. Footnotes and references are included. (KSM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110360

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 008 421

High Schools and the Social Relations of Production

Brent Shea
Department of Sociology
State University of New York at Binghamton

For Presentation

New England Educational Research Association
Provincetown, Massachusetts
May 1, 1975

High Schools and the Social Relations of Production

Educational research - from its concern two decades ago with the "exceptional child," to the emphasis a decade ago on "compensatory education," to its present preoccupation with the failure of reform - has, until recently, been supportive of the social system. And even recently, research which attributes the failure of educational reform to achieve equality to the individual (i.e., genetic endowment) implicitly supports the existing structure of society. Alongside this analysis there occurs the competing explanation that something about the society itself presages the failure of educational reform.

Education has always had as its objective the transmission of the values of a society.[1] According to Durkheim (1956), when a society becomes so complex that it cannot be transmitted without a formal system, its institutional character emerges as a reaction to its function of training students for adequate adult role performance.

Weber, in contrast to Durkheim's conception of schools as homogenizing agencies, saw them as differentiation mechanisms through which inequalities in statuses and roles are bureaucratically allocated, certified, and legitimated (1958). But both Durkheim and Weber, and later Waller (1932) and Jackson (1968), saw educational agencies as reflections of the larger society, which changed in response to the imperatives of that society.[2] According to Durkheim, schools are places where

society recreates itself in the young.

The similarities in values of the school and the work place suggest a conservative inference that their respective structures of social relations are isomorphic; a less conservative and nonetheless plausible conclusion is that the structure and content of social relations in schools accommodates[3] the social relations of production.[4] Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, the major proponents of this thesis, contend that class-specific "hidden curricula" reinforce those noncognitive traits appropriate to the probable occupational destinations of the students in a school, such that, e.g., socialization practices conducive to obedience, industriousness, and restraint will be emphasized in lower class schools and classrooms.

The same phenomenon has been referred to less widely as the "system-maintenance function" of social development in schools (see Hess, 1971), i.e., inculcation of students with attitudes and behavior which produce positive affect for the existing educational and political authority system.[5] Compliance with law and bureaucratic rules is produced through identification, modeling, and conditioning rather than by conceptual learning and teaching. In this way, the system maintenance function of schools, being non-conceptual and manipulative, can be regarded as a hidden curriculum for what is learned though not specifically taught.

Paul Goodman has harshly observed:

> In the junior and senior high school grades, (schools) are an arm of the police, providing cops and concentration camps paid for in the budget under the heading "Board of Education." The educational

> role is, by and large, to provide - at public and parents' expense - apprenticeship training for corporations, government, and the teaching profession itself, and also to train the young, as New York City's Commissioner of Education has said (in the Morley case) "to handle constructively their problems of adjustment to authority." (Goodman, 1969)

One does not have to quote such school critics as Paul Goodman, however. According to a recent US Government panel on youth, "School is a certain kind of environment: individualistic, oriented toward cognitive achievement, imposing dependency on and withholding authority and responsibility from those in the role as students." (Panel on Youth, 1974). Assessments such as this have met with increasing enthusiasm, mainly because they seem to make so much sense in explaining life in schools.[6]

It is frequently observed among those who write about schooling that life in schools is alienating, and that this prepares students for the alienating work life which is to follow:[7,8]

> Mass public education has not evolved into its present bureaucratic, hierarchical, and authoritarian form because of the organizational prerequisites of imparting cognitive skills. Such skills may in fact be more efficiently developed in democratic, non-repressive atmospheres. Rather the social relations of education produce and reinforce those values, attitudes, and affective capacities which allow individuals to move smoothly into an alienated and class-stratified society. (Illich, 1971)

From this perspective, American high schools are seen to be

competitive places which stifle collective efforts. Individualistic, antagonistic competition is promoted in the classroom as well as the gym. The ideal of the atomized individual "making it" by himself, even against the interests of others, is said to be pervasive. Problems confronting high school students are most often cast as purely personal, with attention focused on other students as the cause of the problems. Such a formulation is held to result from the structure and content of schooling.

This competitive spirit of schooling accommodates the competitive spirit of the political-economy, where the problems in people's lives and work are typically seen as individual ones, and usually with other people as their basis (see Mills, 1959; Rytina, Form, and Pease, 1970).[9] Such a perspective acts to divert attention from the existing social structure, consequently maintaining it.

But the competitive values reinforced and possibly inclucated by schools are only one part of the alienating life students experience which anticipates their future occupational role performances. The structure and content of high school curricula additionally mirror the occupational sphere through emphasis on 1) conformity, 2) external rewards, and 3) various noncognitive behaviors. Specifically, high schools are said to value <u>conformity</u> over self-direction. Obedience, that is, is preferred to autonomy. Such behavior is in conformance with the hierarchy of authority in schools and work places alike. The existence of <u>rewards external to the work place</u> - whether grades or Mercurys - motivates the desired conformity. And certain <u>noncognitive behaviors</u>[10] which result in these external rewards are exhibited by successful students as well as successful employees.

The competitive, conforming, reward seeking, personality oriented nature of school and work environments is seen to be evident. It is also evident that different kinds of work are differentiated along these dimensions, with the predicted result that schooling must be similarly differentiated. These dimensions, then, constitute preparation which is functional to successful role performance at various levels of the occupational structure. As Dreeben (1968) contends, "If schooling forms the linkage between the family life of children and the public life of adults, it must provide experiences conducive to learning the principles of conduct and patterns of behavior appropriate to adulthood." Grannis (1967) has pointed out that the organization of work at each level of education provides students with a model of the mode of work organization they will encounter if they terminate their education at that point. This reasoning may be extended: The kind of education a student has provides a model similar to the one provided by the amount.

In less general terms, people who work at "middle class," white collar (conceptually oriented, people oriented) occupations would be expected to meet with experiences in high school that would differ from the experiences people would have who work at "working class," blue collar, manually oriented occupations. The structure and content of social relations in high schools would be different for students in academic, college preparatory tracks than it would be for those in non-academic vocational tracks.

In addition to differences in status, security, and wage structure, it is apparent that "white collar" work requires the exercise of more judgment and autonomy than "blue collar" work. Widely agreed upon desirable traits for white collar and blue collar employees would provide indications of values and behaviors

which schools would seek to differentially cultivate through the structure of social relations. Evidence that such values and behaviors are cultivated might look like this:

A teacher in a non-academic track classroom would be predicted to demand more conformity and obedience, more teacher-directed, teacher-initiated activity than a teacher in an academic track classroom.[11] Only systematic study of the socialization emphases in classrooms of both types would provide evidence of the amount of opportunity students have to exercise judgment, independence, and autonomy.

Problems with the Analysis

Despite the apparent self-evidence that schools replicate the structure of social relations of production, such an analysis presents several problems which have to do primarily with: 1) a challenging consumption interpretation; 2) the uncertain impact of schooling on noncognitive student attributes; 3) the increasingly maladaptive role of schooling in relation to the needs of production; and 4) the absence of an adequate data base.

Production or consumption

The occurrence of a repressive hidden curriculum, alienating in the Marxian sense,[12] which reproduces the social relations of production, has been explained somewhat differently by Ivan Illich (1971), who attributes the character of schooling to the needs of consumption rather than to those of production. According to Illich, schooling develops the noncognitive traits such as docility which are necessary for manipulable consumers: "Once a man or woman has accepted the need for school, he or she is easy prey for other institutions" (in the sphere of product consumption).

Successfully schooled students learn what is standardized, certified, pre-packaged, and purchasable is worthwhile.

Such discussions of the alienated consumer have held some currency in critiques of American life in general.[13] Related observations had been made by Chinoy (1955), e.g., who, in his study of auto workers, remarked that "the concern with immediate gratifications unrelated to one's occupation is encouraged by prevalent values in American society. The massed apparatus of commercial advertising incessantly stimulate the desire for things which are immediately available. . . . American culture has shifted from a central concern with the values of production to the values of consumption." Although his sample of young auto workers verbally professed concern with occupational success, Chinoy concluded they were more likely to be interested in "going out," "having a girl friend," travelling, owning a car or a motorcycle. This consumerization of culture can be construed as contributing to the repressiveness of the social system. Gintis (1972a) would agrue, however, that "the sales pitches of manipulative institutions, rather than generating the values of commodity fetishism, merely capitalize upon and reinforce a set of values derived from and reconfirmed by daily personal experience in the social system." Schooling and advertising, then, could not be explanatory variables in accounting for consumer consciousness, which is generated primarily from the work life experience of individuals. And this experience is such an uninviting context for satisfying activity that the reasonable response of individuals is to emphasize consumption: "It may not be much, but it's all we've got . . . consumer values are not aberrations induced by manipulative socialization" (Gintis, 1972a:81).

Gintis appears to satisfactorily confront Illich's critique,

partially because - although neither says it - the two explanations may not be necessarily incompatible. It seems true that the creation of new markets implies the construction of repressive social relations in order to meet productive needs. That is, through their replication of the alienating structure of social relations of production, schools contribute both to production and consumption of products.[14] The need to shape consumer demands can be seen to be compatible with the need to supply a docile, manipulable labor force, and both needs can be met by bureaucratized schooling. Gintis' objection to Illich's formulation is directed not at its critical assessment of capitalist accumulation, but at the social action this analysis implies: After one has accepted that the character of schooling derives from capitalism's need to manipulate consumer demand rather than from its need to manipulate worker behavior, the program involves addressing the consciousness of people as consumers rather than as producers, and this is unlikely to result in any amelioration of the alienating conditions in the work place.

Gintis claims that unalienating work is possible through decentralization, rotation, worker control, and the reintroduction of craft in production, with reorganization along master-apprentice or group control lines. However, an institutional context with the need to maintain power appears to result in bureaucratic order in production, which, though flexible for decision-making, creates an inflexible work place. Beyond this, technologies and work roles which maximize profits predominate and "product attributes are determined by their contribution to gross sales and growth of the enterprise" (Gintis, 1972a). The control, profit, and growth implicit in capitalist economic institutions imply alienating social relations of production. To summarize Gintis' perspective in his

words,

> It seems clear that schools instill the values of docility, degrees of subordination corresponding to different levels in the hierarchy of production, and motivation according to external reward. It seems also true that they do not reward, but instead penalize behavior. By inhibiting the full development of individual capacities for meaningful individual activity, schools produce Illich's contended outcomes: The individual as passive receptor replaces the individual as active agent. But the articulation with the larger society is <u>production</u> rather than <u>consumption</u>. (my emphasis)

Gintis' most convincing evidence in refutation of Illich's thesis appears to focus on: 1) the extensive historical research (e.g., Katz, 1968, 1971a; Callahan, 1962; Cremin, 1964; Spring, 1972; Cohen and Lazerson, 1972, etc.), which attributes changes in the educational system to changes in the developing system of production; 2) studies by economists (Denison, 1962; Schultz, 1963) showing education to be a major source of economic growth, in its labor training function; and 3) research which demonstrates that noncognitive traits developed through schooling explain more variance in worker productivity than cognitive ones (Gintis, 1971).[15]

<u>Noncognitive effects of schooling</u>

Evidence related to the development in schools of noncognitive traits presents difficulties. The social relations of schools, for example, cannot be said to accommodate the structure of social relations of production if the attempt is made to similarly socialize

students of different social origins and occupational destinations. It must be established first whether such similar socialization occurs and whether such socialization has any impact.

In view of the existence of academic and vocational tracks and the corresponding occupations they prepare students for, it may be assumed that students are socialized differently. But whether the socialization of vocational track students is different from that of college track students, and different regardless of origin status, as postulated by Bowles and Gintis, is not yet certain. If differential socialization practices are employed, whether track-specific or class-specific, the next question is whether such practices have an important impact. While it may be granted that "profit-maximizing firms find it remunerative to hire more highly educated workers at higher pay, even <u>irrespective</u> of differences among individuals in cognitive abilities or attainments" (Gintis, 1971), that schooling imparts these traits may not be so. Jencks (1971), for instance, while attributing great import to noncognitive traits in the explanation of income differences, holds that many of these traits are differentially distributed <u>prior</u> to secondary schooling. Feldman and Newcomb (1970) have made similar observations about higher education on the basis of over 1500 studies. Shea and Rehberg (1973) found that, in relation to 23 noncognitive traits, the effect of schooling was simply to extend pre-existing differences.[16] Astin (1961) takes the extreme position that the effects of schooling can be explained almost entirely when enough student body characteristics are controlled. However, Hess and Torney (1967) and Dreeben (1968) have portrayed the school as having a powerful effect on the formation of student attitudes and values.

One resolution of this issue may be that, owing to the number and diversity of noncognitive traits, different researchers may be addressing different traits. Kohlberg and Rochelle (1972), for instance, say,

> The relatively general, longitudinally stable personality traits which have been identified in earlier childhood are traits of temperament - introversion-extroversion, passivity-activity - which have been shown to be in large part hereditary temperamental traits.

That schooling could have no impact on some noncognitive traits, great impact on others, and merely extend still other, pre-existing traits seems a more plausible explanation in a complex world.

Another resolution may be that, although the values implicit in the structure and content of a school curriculum are similar to the values students espouse, no causal relationship exists. Bereiter (1972) suggests that, e.g., although both students and marking systems are competitive, "we are merely looking at two sides of the same thing, the prevailing values of society." Schooling reflects rather than creates the values. Such an explanation is 1) consistent with the Bowles-Gintis correspondence principle that the values of the capitalist society are replicated in both the school and the home, but 2) inconsistent with the thesis the school inclucates these values: "For the most part people who receive different schooling are already different in other ways that make them non-comparable and that makes it impossible to isolate the effect of schooling" (Bereiter).

Implicit in Bereiter's argument, nevertheless, is some support for the thesis that school inculcates values. While Bereiter doubts the <u>educational</u> impact ("explicit teaching," i.e.,

curriculum content) of schooling, he concedes that the "conditions of child care," i.e., structure of the curriculum, create specific atmospheres which may be permissive or coercive. This appeal to the importance of structure enables Bereiter to deny education's effectiveness at noncognitive development while agreeing with the potential impact of "conditions of child care."

Now, let's consider what noncognitive traits gintis has in mind: " . . . the affective traits that are rewarded in school come to correspond to the needs of alienated production, and this, he postulates, is evident in the social relations of the classroom. These include "degree of subordinancy corresponding to different levels of the hierarchy of production," "primacy of cognitive as opposed to creative modes of social response," (see Gintis, 1969), motivation by the "external reward of grades and promotion," and finally

> . . . Just as the work process is stratified, and workers on different levels in the hierarchy of authority and status are required to display substantively distinct patterns of values, aspirations, personality traits, and modes of "social presentation" (dress, manner of speech, personal identification, and loyalties to a particular social system), so the school system stratifies, tracks, and structures social interaction according to criteria of social class and relative scholastic success. (Gintis, 1971; see also Curti, 1935 and Gorz, 1970)

This last set of noncognitive characteristics comprise "middle class" values, attitudes, manners, and skills that schools, because of the social class background of their teachers and administrators, are frequently said to impart. For example, a

quite recent progressive report on the aims and objectives of education in Canada (Provincial Committee, 1968) cited by Katz (1971d), emphasizes the development of "desirable" attitudes, i.e., reformation of working class into middle class attitudes. Rich (1960) contends,

> Many teachers, failing to recognize the characteristics and social patterns of the lower class child, find that the lower class child is a disciplinary problem, lacks motivation, and does not demonstrate the manners and morals becoming to youth. This lack of understanding seems to stem from the fact that public school teachers typically come from middle class families . . . . Many teachers unintentionally and without realization of the far-reaching consequences, try to get lower class children to adopt a code of behavior that is . . . . quite foreign and unnatural to them . . . . Many teachers discipline in terms of etiquette and manners sanctioned by the middle class and, as a result of this inculcation, many teachers are discouraged to find their efforts unproductive in converting lower class children to their way of behaving.

Harvey (1972) likewise found teachers seldom alter their behavior or curriculum (structure or content) to coincide with the behavior their lower class students displayed. Additionally, the problems schools have with upper middle class as well as lower class students has been pointedly emphasized lately:

> The bureaucratic and professional organization of modern teaching is not making connection with the values and practices of the current urban lower class.

> The daily routines of educational organizations as now structured are also boring increasing numbers of affluent adolescents in the cities and suburbs whose background and life style generates new demands for variety and flexibility in instruction. (Panel on Youth, 1974)

This portrayal of the unsuccessful attempt to inculcate all students, including those from the lower class, with middle class values is quite different from the Bowles-Gintis charge that schools differentially impart such traits in a class-specific way.[17] (See Shea, 1976)

Regardless of the existence of tracking, if the attempt is made in schools to socialize children similarly, schools cannot be said to accommodate the existing structure of social relations. If such an attempt is made, however, the Bowles-Gintis accommodation thesis, i.e., the correspondence principle, is made more credible. Evidence for the thesis includes Harvey's (1972) findings that, compared to teachers in middle class classrooms, teachers in lower class classrooms were more directive, and that behavioral control appeared to be the primary goal.

Schools can accommodate the social relations of production simply by their development of specific attributes which are adaptive to the work place. Or schools can fail to accommodate the social relations of production through uniform attempts at inculting all students with similar middle class values, which - to the extent such inculcation efforts are successful - would be frequently maladaptive to the work place.

Schooling as preparation for class-specific work

If it is true that classroom socialization anticipates the social relations of the work place, current worker dissatisfaction is not easy to explain. The "over-education" or "under-utilization" which currently characterizes the work force is substantial evidence for the thesis that schooling does not accommodate the needs of production. Assembly line workers with several years of college, e.g., seem less content than those with only a high school diploma (see Berg, 1972; Shea, 1975).

The Carnegie Commission projection that by 1980, twenty-five percent of those graduating from college will occupy occupational slots held by high school graduates a decade earlier forecasts greater worker dissatisfaction, especially when only half of these positions will be "upgraded" or "enriched" at all, i.e., only the qualifications will be changed, not the nature of the work.

Aronowitz (1973) argues convincingly that not only are work requirements becoming artifically high (see Yager, 1972), but that the disappointment experienced by those filling these positions is potentially radicalizing. Much current evidence to support the effects of over-education on the work force thesis is anecdotal. However, it is difficult to support that schooling accommodates the needs of production when the training for independence and autonomy said to occur in both colleges and college preparatory high school tracks provides workers with precisely those qualities which they could not use in the work place.

An adequate data base

That the structure of social relations in high schools is different for students in academic, college preprartory tracks than it is for those in non-academic, vocational tracks requires more evidence than currently exists. The research proposed here has track assignment as the independent variable. About one-half of all US high schools employ a tracking system. Tracks are understood to comprise career lines, e.g., college preparatory, vocational, technical, industrial, business, general, basis, and remedial curricula. Students in different tracks are separated into different courses or different classes of the same course, although sometimes students from different tracks take the same course in the same classroom. The importance of tracking in the present study is the degree to which it anticipates the occupational roles of students. While it is plausible that academic track students are being socialized for professional and semi-professional occupations, students in the vocational track are being socialized for unskilled industrial work, and students in the general business-commercial track are being socialized for skilled and semi-skilled service occupations.

Classroom socialization, the dependent variable, will be defined by characteristics descriptive of self-reported teacher emphases on the following behaviors:

neatness
punctuality
obedience
docility
subordinancy
respect for rules
conformity
independence
judgment
creativity
internalization of rules
autonomy
curiosity
originality

It is hypothesized that differences in emphasis or non-emphasis on these behaviors will be greater between tracks than within them. Interview data will be collected from the population of teachers at two comprehensive high schools. Interviewing the population has the advantage of avoiding sampling problems as well as insuring that some interviewed teachers will be assigned to two or possibly three different tracks. The analysis may emphasize the responses from these teachers, in order to determine to what extent students in different tracks are socialized differently, ceteris paribus. Hypotheses will be accepted or rejected on the basis of an analysis of variance, which will permit comparison of within track differences to between track differences in teacher socialization practices.

Conclusion

Because of both the intuitive appeal of the Bowles-Gintis thesis and its increasing acceptance, the data would be expected to support it. If the social relations of the classroom are found not to replicate those of the work place, at least required data will have been brought to bear on the thesis, and at most the thesis will be called into question.

The institutionalization of any explanation involves first its widespread acceptance, then its gradual and tentative rejection, and finally its modification and incorporation into a larger framework. In these terms, the present research would contribute either to the closing of the first stage or the opening of the second.

Research addressing the Bowles-Gintis version of why educational reforms fail to achieve equality holds an unusual place in educational research. It does not attribute this failure to genetic, community, or family influences, or even to schooling itself. To the extent this structural explanation for the failure of educational reforms can be empirically supported, it will challenge the means of production that schools are said to accommodate.

FOOTNOTES

1 As Sewell and Hauser (1972) observe, the founders of the discipline, including Ward, Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, and Cooley, were interested in the role of schooling in passing on the social and cultural heritage. Broad statements about education's role in cultural transmission, socialization, social control, and social progress characterized the pre-World War II sociology of education literature; various types and levels of education were not specifically treated (see Clark, 1974; Kohlberg and Rochelle, 1972).

2 Much more recently, Paul Goodman (1969) has observed, "Out schools reflect society very closely, except that they emphasize many of its worst features." George Leonard, in Education and Ecstasy, says, "'Right answers,' specialization, standardization, narrow competition, eager acquisition, aggression, detachment from the self, without them, it has seemed, the social machinery would break down. Do not call the schools cruel or unnatural for . . . furthering what society has demanded."

3 Accommodation is used here in view of the Bowles and Gintis (1974) observation that " . . . the day to day contact of parents and children with the competitive, cognitively oriented school environment . . . buttresses in a very immediate and concrete way the technocratic perspective on economic organization."

4 "Social relations of production" is defined by Bowles and Gintis (1974) as "the system of rights and responsibilities, duties and rewards, that govern the interaction of all individuals involved in organized productive activity." (See also Gorz, 1970) The Social relations of production form the basis for such divergent stratification systems as caste, feudal, serf, community-collective, and the wage labor or capitalist and state capitalist types. The stratification system of advanced capitalist societies is based on a hierarchical division of labor, with top-down power and control (Weber, 1958; Marglin, 1971).

5 George Leonard has observed, "The task of preventing the new generation from changing in any deep or significant way is precisely what most societies require of their educators."

6 An alternative explanation for the emphasis on control in schools is simply that, in any large group of people, a central focus must necessarily be on methods of control: "To reorganize a school in such a way that young persons have responsibility and authority appears extremely difficult, because such reorganization is incompatible with the basis custodial function of the school." (Panel on Youth, 1974) But such an explanation implies no variation in crowd control techniques within a school, unless teacher backgrounds differ by curriculum type and pupil type, or unless control is adapted to the social class of the students.

7 Alienation as it is used here refers to social processes rather than to psychological states. Work is understood to be alienating to the extent that its historical development, content, and structure exist apart from workers.

8 Although how schools alienate students differentially will be considered later, it should be suggested at the onset that schools alienate all students by: "passivity, subordination, forced separation from self, fragmented sequencing of learning, age segregation, isolation from community life with the unrealities of school that follow, an almost exclusive instrumental emphasis on future gains from schooling." (Schafer, et al., 1970).

9 Ferrandino (1969), in a discussion of youth culture in the United States during the 50's and 60's, contends that the level of consciousness was at the level of individual consciousness: "If one couldn't make it (sexually, socially) it was his own fault and not the system's, i.e., the connections that seemingly 'individual' problems of 'adjustment' and an exploitative, oppressive social system hadn't been made."

10 The noncognitive behaviors referred to here are different from the ones referred to by Jencks when he says the noncognitive impact of schooling is minor. The political economists usually refer to noncognitive traits which are more subject to change than, e.g., the personality traits such as passivity and introversion.

11 Parsons (1959) was specifically concerned with the classroom socialization of the child, with its inculcation of values and norms. Both Durkheim and Weber saw the teacher as the socializing agent in the school.

12 For some concrete expression of the alienating nature of schooling and the work place, consider such songs as the Coasters' "Charley Brown," Chuck Berry's "School Days," the Silhouettes' "Get A Job," and Fats Dominoes' "Blue Monday," all of which were popular in the 50's as well as more recently.

13 Illich (1971) observes that severe dislocations deriving from fragmentation of work and the community and institutionalized inequalities are contained in mental and penal institutions.

14 In his analysis of the popular music of the 60's, Ferrandino (1969) points out the individual pseudo-problems which dominated lyrics, e.g., "can one make it with Marsha on Saturday night?"

15 Indeed, according to Bowles and Gintis (1974), " . . . for the vast majority of workers and jobs, selection, assessed job adequacy, and promotion are based on attributes other than I. Q."

16 For additional evidence on the lack of noncognitive impact of schooling, see also Davis (1971), Berg (1970), Collins (1971), Fullan and Loubser (1972), Frymier (1971), and Backman et al. (1971).

17 Hollingshead (1949) observed that teachers believed academic track students have greater motivation or "perhaps teachers may be satisfying their desire to see students reflect the academic values they hold." Too, the I. Q. distribution did not account for the concentration of higher grade point averages among upper SES students. All of which suggests that noncognitive traits of college track students are paramount in explaining their success in a curriculum preparatory to white collar work.

REFERENCES*

Aronowitz, Stanley
1973 False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Class Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bereiter, Carl
1972 "Schools without education." Harvard Educational Review 42 (August): 390-413.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis
1974 "IQ in the United States class structure." Pp. 7-84 in Alan Gartner, Colin Greer and Frank Riessman (eds.), The New Assault on Equality: IQ and Social Stratification. New York: Harper and Row.

1975 Nightmares and Visions: Capitalism and Education in the United States. New York: Harper and Row (in press).

Callahan, Raymond E.
1962 Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chinoy, Eli
1955 Automobile Workers and the American Dream. New York: Random House.

Clark, Burton R.
1974 "Development of the sociology of higher education." Sociology of Education 46 (Winter): 2-14.

Cohen, David and Marvin Lazerson
1972 "Education and the corporate order." Socialist Revolution (March):

Collins, Randall
1971 "Educational requirements for employment: a comparative organizational study." Manuscript.

Cremin, Lawrence
1964 The Transformation of the School. New York: Knopf.

Curti, Merle
1955 The Social Ideas of American Educators. Chicago: C. Scribner's Sons.

Denison, Edward F.
1962 The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternatives before Us. New York: Committee for Economic Development.

Dreeben, Robert
1968 On What Is Learned in School. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Durkheim, Emile
1956 Education and Society. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press (trans., Sherwood D. Fox).

Ferrandino, Joe
1969 "Rock culture and the development of social consciousness." Radical America (May/June): 23-49.

Gintis, Herbert
1969 Alienation and Power: Towards a Radical Welfare Economics. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.

1971 "Education, technology, and the characteristics of worker productivity." American Economics Review 61 (May): 266-279.

1972 "Towards a political economy of education: a radical critique of Ivan Illich's Deschooling Society." Harvard Educational Review 42 (February): 70-97.

Goodman, Paul
1969 Compulsory Mis-education. New York: Random House.

Gorz, Andre
1970 "Capitalist relations of production and the socially necessary labor force." Arthur Lothstein (ed.), All We Are Saying . . . New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Grannis, Joseph C.
1967 "The school as a model of society." HGSEA Bulletin 12 (2).

Harvey, Mary Ruth
1972 Differential Treatment of Upper-Income Children in the Public Schools. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Hess, Robert D.
1971 "The system maintenance function of social development in the schools." Pp. 15-27 in Educational Change: Implications for Measurement. Procedings of the 1971 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, Educational Testing Service.

_____ and J. V. Torney
1967 The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine.

Hollingshead, August B.
1949 Elmtown's Youth: The Impact of Social Class on Adolescents. New York: Wiley.

Illich, Ivan
1971 De-schooling Society. New York: Harper and Row.

Jackson, Philip W.
1968 Life in the Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Katz, Michael B.
1968 The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

1971a Class, Bureaucracy, and the Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger.

1971d "The present moment in educational reform." Harvard Educational Review 41 (3): 342-359.

Kohlberg, Lawrence and Rochelle Mayer
1972 "Development as the aim of education." Harvard Educational Review 42 (November): 449-496.

Leonard, George
Education and Ecstasy. New York:

Marglin, Stephen
1971 "What do bosses do?" Manuscript, Harvard University

Panel on Youth, President's Science Advisory Committee
1971 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parsons, Talcott
1959 "The school as a social system: some of its functions in American Society." Harvard Educational Review 29 (Fall): 297-318.

Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of the Schools of Ontario
1968 Living and Learning. Toronto: Newton Publishing Co.

Schafer, Walter E., Carol Olexa, and Kenneth Polk
1970 "Programmed for social class." Trans-Action (October):

Schultz, Theodore
1963 The Economic Value of Education. New York: Columbia University Press.

Shea, Brent
1975 "Two-Year Colleges and Inequality." Integrated Education 13 (January/February): 38-44.

1976 "Schooling and its antecedents: substantive and methodological issues in the status attainment process." Review of Educational Research (Spring, forthcoming).

Weber, Max
1958 "On bureaucracy" and "The meaning of discipline" in Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.

Yager, Thomas Joseph
1972 Inflationary Credentialism. Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University.

*references subject to corrections and additions